

Concordia University

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, April 8, 1988

Present: C. Bertrand, Chair; Bill Spanos; P. Albert; G. Valaskakis;
R. Martin; D. Dicks; J. Appleby; R. Cronin, s.j.;
H. McQueen; R. Pallen; D. Brown; D. Murphy; G. Auchinachie;
K. Mukherji; R. Kilgour; G. Decarie; J. Locke; W. Byers;
C. Barton; J. McGraw; S. Dubas, s.j.; T. Arbuckle-Maag;
M. Oppenheim; J. Drysdale; G. Newsham; W. Hooper; J. Ryan;
G. Trudel; H. Shulman; C. Davis; M. Verthuy; R. Seppanenn;
K. Johnston; C. Buttner; S. O'Hara; R. Orr; A. MacPherson;
D. Jean; S. Kogan; S. Maguire; M. Valihora

Regrets: F. Shlosser; W. Knitter; L. Van Toch; M. Barlow; D. Salee;
G. Szamosi

Absent: M. Anvari; J. Gavin; F. Mueller; L. Crysler; D. White;
M. Clarke; K. Adler; J. Bardis; J. King; A. Madsen;
L.-J. Regimbald; L. Piovesan

Guests: G. Breton, Psychology

Documents considered and distributed at this meeting:

- ASFC 88-4M-A Restriction on credits first year students entering the Faculty of Arts and Science should be allowed to take outside the Faculty (ASFC 88-3M-F)
- ASFC 88-4M-B Memorandum of March 8, 1988 from H. Shulman to C.L. Bertrand regarding entry scholarships.
- ASFC 88-4M-C Report 60 U - 1989-90 Undergraduate Curriculum Course Change Proposals (C1 to C6)
- ASFC 88-4M-C Report 61 G - 1989-90 Graduate Curriculum Course Change Proposals (C7 to C10)
- ASFC 88-4M-D Department of Chemistry- Name Change
- ASFC 88-4M-E Report 59 U - Proposed Amendment to the Regulation on the Prohibition of Examinations in the last week of term
- ASFC 88-4M-F Notice of elections for Faculty of Arts and Science Committees
- ASFC 88-4M-G "The infamous ESL case" article

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

88-4-1 It was moved and seconded (Mukherji/Dicks) to approve the agenda.

The Chair stated that item 5.c) would not be an agenda item, but rather an item of information under his remarks.

One member (Ryan) pointed out what he viewed as an irregularity regarding item 5.a) (i.e. the motion to rescind a previous motion which approved the establishment of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities). It was viewed "highly irregular" that, instead of having this item on the agenda as an election item, it was displaced by a motion to rescind. It was stressed that both the member's remarks, as well as his objections to the agenda, were to be included in the minutes. The Chair responded that item 5.a) will be addressed in accordance with the agenda.

Vote: Carried

3. Approval of Minutes of March 4, 1988

88-4-2 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Pallen) to approve the Minutes of March 4, 1988.

Inconsistency in use of names and attributions was pointed out (Ryan) and it was asked (Ryan) that the Office of the Dean adopt a consistent policy regarding the format to be used. In response the Chair stated that the Office of the Dean was moving towards a more uniform system, and that the advice of the Steering Committee had been to eliminate names from the minutes with the exceptions of movers and seconders, and the Dean or Vice-Deans when they made official statements.

Another member (Oppenheim) suggested that there be further discussion on whether or not Faculty Council wishes to adopt the format of Senate (which omits names). There are difficulties when names are omitted as members cannot easily verify their own remarks.

The Chair took these remarks as a notice of motion for Steering Committee to consider the matter at its next meeting.

Carried

Chairperson's Remarks

- 1) The Chair announced the awarding of a three year grant totalling over half a million U.S. dollars by the National Institute of Mental Health in the United States to a research team led by Dr. Alex Schwarzman in the Psychology Department. This is the largest grant the Faculty of Arts and Science has ever received for this kind of research effort. The Dean congratulated Dr. Schwarzman and the other members of the research team.
- 2) Dean Bertrand announced that Vice-Dean Valaskakis, Dicks and Albert have agreed to serve again in their respective positions. Dr. Pallen will serve as Acting Vice-Dean replacing P. Albert while on sabbatical leave. Dr. S. Ruby of the Biology Department has accepted the appointment of Vice-Dean, Student Affairs. Dr. Shlosser will return to the History Department, following her sabbatical leave.
- 3) Also announced was the donation of \$10,000. to Concordia University by the relatives of the late Prof. B.S. Singh to endow the "Prof. Balvir Ranja Singh Memorial Scholarship" for the Department of Economics.
- 4) A notice of Election for various Arts and Science Faculty Committees was announced. Nominations were invited to be forwarded to the Office of the Dean by April 22, 1988.
- 5) With regard to the question raised at the last ASFC meeting regarding the Library budget and the issue of the user-driven aspects of the budget, Mr. Mate has been invited to the May 13, 1988 meeting to respond to any questions Faculty Council members might have.
- 6) It was confirmed that A. MacPherson received the requested list of courses in which final examinations can be given during the last week of the term.
- 7) The Chair informed Council members of H. Shulman's memo requesting a review of the way that the entry scholarships are distributed in the University. Steering Committee recommended at its last meeting (March 30, 1988) that this item be sent to the Curriculum Committee in the first instance, and that the Curriculum Committee report to Faculty Council in the future (presumably in September 1988).

5. Questions and Announcements

- 1) It was pointed out that R. Cronin is no longer on the Faculty Honours Committee. He was replaced by R. Coyte. This is to be verified.

The Chair advised that the Office of the Dean is preparing an accurate and up-to-date list of all the members on the various Arts and Science Faculty committees. It was mentioned that S.J. Sullivan will be going on sabbatical.

- 2) In response to a question regarding the policy on take-home exams in terms of deadlines, the Chair and Vice-Dean Dicks confirmed that there was no official policy other than what is in the Undergraduate Calendar. The Calendar states that the instructor lays out the policy during the first week of classes (Dicks). The outside limit would be the last day for submitting grades (Bertrand). This item was referred to the Curriculum Committee.
- 3) In response to a question, R. Martin confirmed that the Undergraduate Calendar clearly indicates that there is no legal requirement that students should know their mid-term marks before the course drop date.
- 4) It was asked whether the Scheduling Office was aware of the problem of lectures being disrupted due to classroom noise in certain courses. When asked about prevention of such disruptions in the future, the Dean confirmed that the matter would be investigated with M. Tralton. The Dean will report on developments at the next ASFC meeting.

It was suggested that part of the noise problem could be resolved by having a basement built in the new Concert Hall (which according to the Thursday Report was decided against by the University). The Dean responded that the University's decision not to build a basement was made on the basis of the high cost involved (approximately 1.5 million more).

6. Business arising from ASFC minutes of March 4, 1988

- a) Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities
(Motion to Rescind)

J. Drysdale introduced the motion to rescind the motion adopted at the last ASFC meeting. The following points were cited as background to the motion to rescind:

- 1) Although the motion was adopted by a majority (14 in favour, 10 opposed, 7 abstentions) it received less than majority support when abstentions are included. Thus, although technically the motion passed, in actuality (considering the abstentions) the motion received only a weak mandate, so weak in fact as to call into question the viability of the proposal.
- 2) However, the major focus of critical discussion on this motion was the composition of the committee (i.e. should the committee be composed as originally proposed or alternatively should the committee be composed of the Dean and the four Vice-Deans).
- 3) Although the motion was adopted and a notice of election was given and communicated to the Chairs, Principals and Directors of the Faculty at the last ASFC meeting, as of the latest meeting of the Steering Committee (March 30, 1988) not a single nomination for any position on the committee had been received by the Office of the Dean.
- 4) In the meeting of Chairs, Principals and Directors of March 22, 1988, the consensus of the discussion appeared to support the idea that Council's motion should be rescinded and replaced by a motion mandating the Dean and Vice-Deans to prepare the Faculty report on planning and priorities.
- 5) It needs to be stated clearly and for the record that the original motion which specified an elected faculty/student committee was initiated and brought to the Steering Committee by the Dean. The alternative proposal that the committee be composed of the Dean and the four Vice-Deans was proposed by faculty members of this Council.

Considering the above points, and as the person who made and voted for the original motion, Dr. Drysdale stated that he had become persuaded that the motion should be rescinded in order to change the composition of the committee.

88-4-3 It was moved and seconded (Drysdale/Pallen) that:

Council vote to rescind the motion that was adopted at the ASFC meeting of March 4, 1988, regarding the establishment of an Ad-Hoc Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Discussion

In response to Dr. Drysdale's reference to the Meeting of Chairs, Principals and Directors of March 22, 1988, the following paragraph from the notes of the meeting was quoted (Ryan):

"The debate should not be re-opened. It would not be wise to set a precedent. After all the vote was carried. The Ad-Hoc Committee can do as good a job as the Vice-Deans."

It was stated (Ryan) that while the English was not eloquent the meaning was clear. It was further recommended (Ryan) that established procedures in "just about any delivery to the body that follows Rules of Order says that when a vote has been taken and a motion declared either carried or lost that decision becomes formally the decision of the body in question and is so recorded. If it should become necessary to rescind a motion that has been passed, notice should be given at a later meeting and a motion for rescinding should be introduced and dealt with at a subsequent meeting. A decision reached by due process must be recognised and observed as such by all concerned. If it involves actions of whatever nature, such as the action of election, that action must be taken".

In response to the above, the Dean quoted the following paragraph from "Robert's Rules of Order" and "Kerr King's Procedures for Meetings and Organizations":

- 1) "Paragraph 136. To Rescind a Previously Approved Substantive Motion

(a) Purpose. This motion enables a previously approved substantive motion to be replaced, if it has outworn its usefulness or is demonstrated not to achieve its intended purpose. The motion can be moved at any subsequent meeting, provided proper notice of this intention is included in the agenda (paragraph 62)."

(extract from Procedures for Meetings and Organisations)

The Chair added that Dr. Drysdale's remarks regarding the motion to rescind is based on the discovery that the motion that was passed at the last ASFC meeting does not appear to achieve "its intended purpose".

- 2) "25. Rescind. When an assembly wishes to annul some action it has previously taken and it is too late to reconsider [para.27] the vote, the proper

course to pursue is to Rescind the objectionable resolution, order, or other proceeding. This motion has no privilege but stands on a footing with a new resolution. Any action of the body can be rescinded regardless of the time that has elapsed".

(extract from Robert's Rules of Order)

In response to the reference to the Notes from the March 22 meeting of Chairs, Principals and Directors, Dr. Drysdale confirmed that the quoted statements were remarks made by one person. In the course of subsequent discussion a consensus did emerge, and was noted as such by the Chair and no one objected to it. The quoted statements do not falsify the fact that there was a consensus among the Chairs.

One member (Verthuy) expressed concern regarding the idea of "going back to look at the distribution of the vote to justify rescinding it". While the lack of nominations was considered extremely telling, there was a majority vote which in theory binds Council to the vote that was taken in consideration of the principles of the society in which we live. To rescind the motion on the basis of a "weak" vote would be extremely dangerous political practice.

Another member (Brown) objected to the motion to rescind based on his understanding of Robert's Rules of Order (i.e. that notice of the motion to rescind - or annul - must be given at one meeting and voted on at a subsequent meeting, or that a motion to rescind can be made at any meeting but requires a two thirds (2/3) majority or an absolute majority of all members absent and present).

The Dean responded that Robert's Rules of Order did not state the above. He quoted point 25 of Robert's Rules of Order - p.52:

"25. Rescind. When an assembly wishes to annul some action it has previously taken and it is too late to reconsider [para.27] the vote, the proper course to pursue is to Rescind the objectionable resolution, order, or other proceeding. This motion has no privilege but stands on a footing with a new resolution. Any action of the body can be rescinded regardless of the time that has elapsed.*

* Where it is desired not only to rescind the action but to express very strong disapproval, legislative bodies have on rare occasions voted to rescind

the objectionable resolution and expunge it from the record, which is done by crossing out the words, or drawing a line around them, and writing across them the words "Expunged by order of the assembly, etc.," giving the date of the order".

The above quotation was according to the member (Brown) the wrong section, and he gave notice of his intention to bring his copy of Robert's Rules of Order to the next ASFC meeting in the belief that the Chair will have to stand corrected. There was no objection to this notice.

It was commented (Valaskakis) that Council should consider the substance of the issue - which is that Faculty Council should determine the will of the group with regard to the issue of academic planning and find a method to address the issue of academic planning.

It was stated (Ryan) that Faculty Council should not be quarreling about secondary matters. However, it was stressed again (Ryan) that announcing the motion to rescind in the agenda two days before the meeting was "clearly out of order". According to Bourinot, the motion should have been stated word by word and communicated at the last meeting.

It was further stated (Ryan) that without consultation with anyone the decision of Council which mandated an election to be held at this meeting was displaced as an agenda item and replaced by the motion to rescind. The Administration should have also taken some initiative in obtaining nominations. Furthermore, even if the vote indicated indecision and uncertainty, the vote taken at the last ASFC meeting should be respected.

Another member agreed (Arbuckle-Maag) that one should not go back to recount a vote that was taken. On the other hand, feedback obtained from her department indicated that there was opposition to the idea of the Ad-Hoc Committee being a faculty committee. Since the first stage of the process was that the department provides a departmental plan, the next stage should be that the Dean and Vice-Deans prepare a Faculty plan to be debated at Faculty Council. If the Chairs in general had this consensus at their meeting, then one can understand why they did not nominate faculty members for the committee.

It was also pointed out (Arbuckle-Maag) that regardless of the composition of the committee, Faculty Council would eventually review the plan; it would not be imposed by the

Administration. Another issue that was felt important (Arbuckle-Maag) was the fact that not all Chairs are represented at Council. When the Committee of Chairs has a consensus on an issue, Council should be aware of and give due consideration to the views of the Chairs. It was further stated (Arbuckle-Maag) that even though she was personally opposed to the idea of "going back" on motions previously adopted, she supported the motion to rescind at the last Steering Committee meeting based on the feedback obtained, and Faculty Council should consider the substance of the issue.

It was added (Oppenheim) that Council should indeed be concerned with the issue of substance and that Council should decide at this point whether or not a mistake has been made. While he felt it was a bad precedent to "go back on" a motion that was passed by a previous meeting, nevertheless, considering that the discussions of the Chair's meeting and the consensus there that the original motion was not satisfactory and the expressed preference for a committee composed of the Dean and Vice-Deans, he agreed that Faculty Council had the right to decide at this point whether or not it wished to pass another motion on the matter.

It was further stated (Barton) that Faculty Council should have a mechanism whereby it can correct a mistake if this is desirable. However, two issues of concern were stressed--first, the issue of not knowing according to what rules of order Council proceeds (this matter should be considered by the Steering Committee) and second, the idea that a motion's being carried only by a small majority should not become criterion for rescinding it. He suggested that this particular criterion be expunged from the records of this Council.

In response to the question (Orr) of whether an alternative structure has been proposed to replace the Ad-Hoc Committee, the Dean stated that the Dean and Vice-Deans would prepare a preliminary report to be brought to Faculty Council, in September. This idea was supported by the members of the Chairs, Principals and Directors at their last meeting. Therefore, if the motion to rescind was passed, Faculty Council would not need to take any other action, as Faculty Planning is part of the Dean's mandate.

In response to the previous suggestion to expunge one of the criteria mentioned in support of the motion to rescind, the Dean stated that the suggestion will be part of the record; however he did not wish to entertain a new motion to expunge the criteria as this motion would interfere with the motion on the floor.

It was added (Brown) that it is essential that Faculty Council have rules by which it operates and governs itself. It was further commented (Brown) that it seemed "strange" that Council should follow the American Robert's Rules of Order while in Canada Bourinot is the standard for the House of Commons and generally most deliberative bodies. Burino was quoted:

Paragraph 21 - Reconsideration of a Question

"A reconsideration rule provides that a person must give due notice in writing that he will move at the next meeting held thereafter for reconsideration of a question."

He advised (Brown) that he will forward to all members present a copy from the pertinent section from Robert's Rules of Order which he was certain supports Burino.

It was further stated (Ryan) that Faculty Council was addressing two issues at once. The first issue dealt with the consideration of a previously adopted motion and whether or not Council felt comfortable with rescinding it. The second issue dealt with the alternative to the originally proposed committee.

Objection was made (Ryan) to the fact that the choice was between either defeating the motion to rescind and staying with the original Ad-Hoc Committee or having a committee composed of the Dean and the Vice-Deans.

While it was felt (Ryan) that, on one hand, the Dean and Vice-Deans had the knowledge and experience to deal with this type of project; on the other hand, it was stated (Ryan) that there may be a conflict of interest between the Administration and the Faculty; there may be two conflicting agendas; very often the Administration may have a hidden agenda beyond what appears on documents.

It was agreed (Ryan) that planning should take place; however, there are divergent points of view between Faculty and Administration. It was asserted (Ryan) that the Administration is not to be trusted with vetting departmental documents in terms of departmental priorities.

As there was a doubt regarding whether sufficient time had elapsed between the notice to rescind and the rescinding of the motion, it was asked (Newsham) whether it would be possible to give notice of the motion to rescind at this meeting, and discuss the issue at the next meeting. In response, the Dean confirmed that notice was properly given, as it was given in the agenda.

- 3) The Deans' Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities be composed of the four Vice-Deans of the Faculty of Arts and Science.
- 4) The Mandate of the Deans' Committee for Academic Planning and Priorities will be to review the submissions from departments, colleges and other units, programmes, and individual members of the Faculty, and to prepare a document for Council which recommends planning priorities for the Faculty of Arts and Science for the 1989-90 and 1990-91 academic years.
- 5) The Deans' Committee will present a preliminary report to Faculty Council at the September 1988 meeting, and a final report at the October 1988 meeting.

The above motion was further supported (Newsham) as the document to be prepared by the Deans' Committee will be presented to Council for a vote, and feedback had indicated that many faculty members would not wish to be present throughout the summer to participate in such a committee.

It was observed (Ryan) that this committee was not a Deans' Committee; this was the Dean's Office, which does not represent a diversity of points of view within the University or the Faculty. It is simply the Dean's Office telling faculty members what they think they want to do. The results of their deliberations may be entirely fair and representative, but, on the other hand, in principle it is possible for something else to happen. Faculty Council might as well admit that this is not a Committee at all; Council is merely telling the Dean's Office to do their work and not bother faculty members at all.

CARRIED

- b) Restriction regarding the number of credits new students entering the Faculty of Arts and Science should be allowed to take

88-4-7 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Pallen) to table document ASFC 88-4M-A regarding the original motion (ASFC 88-3M-F) that dealt with restricting the number of credits new students entering the Faculty of Arts and Science should be allowed to take outside the Faculty in their first year.

As mover of the original motion (Dicks) and with the agreement of the seconder (Trudel), it was proposed (Dicks)

that Faculty Council consider changing the motion following the Steering Committee's recommendation, as follows:

"That in their first 30 credits, all students in Arts and Science undergraduate programmes will be allowed to register in no more than 6 credits in the Faculty of Commerce and Administration."

It was stated (Dubas) that students in the Physics Department and Marketing Programme should not be restricted in any way in completing their programme requirements. It was suggested (Arbuckle-Maag) that if this is the only such programme, a statement such as "with the exception of students registered in the programme of Physics and Marketing" could be added to the proposed motion.

It was added (Dicks) that while such a restriction is important, there seems to be a problem with universal application.

In response, it was mentioned (Trudel) that students in programmes which required them to take more credits outside the Faculty (i.e. the Physics/Marketing programme or the Minor in Business Studies) would be exempt from this rule.

It was added (Dicks) that the phrase "except as mandated by specific programmes" could be added. This would allow the Faculty to have new programmes that would require students to take more than 6 credits outside the Faculty.

It was questioned (Jean) whether it would be possible simply to specify the 6 credit limit as "6 elective credits". This clarification may be sufficient for the purpose of this motion.

The Dean confirmed that this suggestion was mentioned at the last ASFC meeting, but this would not work as it is not specific enough.

In response to a question (Auchinachie) regarding the exact problem this motion was addressing, it was stated (Dicks) that the purpose of the motion was to avoid having students in Arts and Science who take most of their courses outside the Faculty. By allowing students (who originally entered the Arts and Science Faculty) to take courses outside the Faculty we are encouraging them to use the Arts and Science Faculty as an entry to the University without making any commitment to an Arts and Science programme.

It was commented (Auchinachie) that such a restriction would limit students who are completing an Arts and Science

programme, from taking courses in another area, which may be beneficial to them in practical terms. Students should be allowed to get as much out of the University as they can.

In response it was confirmed (Dicks) that the limit only applies to first year students.

The Dean confirmed that the major issue that initiated this whole discussion was the concern of faculty members in the Humanities and Social Sciences in particular regarding students who had no interest in being in their courses but were simply waiting to get into the Faculty of Commerce and Administration. The motion is not intended to prevent all Arts and Science students from taking courses in other Faculties, but rather to ensure some kind of commitment to Arts and Science when students first enter the Faculty.

It was further stated (Oppenheim) that Faculty Council should not restrict the number of courses students are allowed to take outside the Faculty; this is an advising issue and advisors should direct students as to what courses must be taken as part of a specific programme. The issue of having uninterested students in the classroom should be a concern to the professor but not to Council. Proper advising, and not a motion by Faculty Council, should resolve the issue.

It was agreed (Murphy) that the proposed motion would not solve student's apathy in certain courses; it is also prejudicial to specify that students should not be allowed to take more than 6 credits in one particular Faculty.

It was further added (Decarie) that while this motion will not affect student's interest nor change certain advisor's indifference nor stop students from manipulating forms after having seen an advisor, it seems to be the only rule that will discourage the wastage of the first year in Arts and Science that is used to get into other Faculties.

It was pointed out (Martin) that those students who will want to transfer to the Faculty of Commerce and Administration must maintain a B average to be eligible for transfer. There is an incentive for these students to perform satisfactorily while in Arts and Science. The existence of quotas in the Faculty of Commerce and Administration limits entry into the Faculty, which results in students choosing Arts and Science (as a second choice) if they want to be a university student. Some of these students will transfer in their second year; however, others will remain in the Arts and Science Faculty simply because this is their only choice.

It was felt (Martin) that this general problem will not be solved through the adoption of the proposed motion. The adoption of the GPA will most probably address this problem in a much more significant way.

The proposed motion was once again clarified for the purpose of a vote, as follows:

"That in their first 30 credits, all students in Arts and Science undergraduate programmes will be allowed to register in no more than 6 credits in the Faculty of Commerce and Administration, except where required by a specific programme."

Vote: CARRIED

(in favour 23, opposed 10, abstentions 7)

New Business

7. a) Curriculum Course Change Proposals 1989-90:

Undergraduate (Document ASFC 88-4M-C, Report 60 U, Part 1)

The members were advised (Dicks) that this was the first set of 1989-90 Curriculum Change Proposals. Further 1989-90 Curriculum Change Proposals will be presented in the upcoming May meetings of Faculty Council.

- 88-4-8 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Trudel) that Faculty Council adopt the 1989-90 Undergraduate Curriculum Course Change Proposals (Document ASFC 88-4M-C, Report 60 U, Part 1).

Chemistry (C-1)

It was clarified (Dicks) that the Chemistry changes regarding the suspension of the Medicinal Chemistry Option is occurring due to the lack of full-time faculty to run this programme for the next three years.

It was questioned (Mukherji) whether the suspension of the Medicinal Chemistry Option would pose problems for students planning to attend Medical School.

In response it was clarified (Pallen) that this Option was not intended for students planning to attend Medical School; such students would not enrol in this option. The reason for the suspension is the fact that the person who is the expert in these courses, Dr. Nogrady, is on a reduced load due to gradual retirement. The intention is to continue giving the courses while the program is in suspension as

long as part-time faculty can be found to do so. However, the department did not want to have students register in the program on the hope that part-time faculty would be found. In the future full-time faculty will be hired to give these courses, and hence the Option is only suspended rather than cancelled.

Clarification was requested (Martin) regarding the addition of the requirement that students who register in the Specialization in Synthetic Materials "be enrolled in the Chemistry Co-op programme".

In response it was stated (Pallen) that this requirement was part of the original proposal adopted by Faculty Council when the Specialization in Synthetic Materials was first adopted.

There was concern (Martin) regarding the students who have gone through a certain portion of the Specialization programme and for some reason do not meet the standards of the Co-op programme.

In response it was confirmed (Pallen) that there were no students in the programme at this time, and that the Specialization in Synthetic Materials is not accepted by the Order of Chemists; students in the Specialization would have difficulty finding work as chemists. The programme was introduced because there were some employers of Co-op students who had expressed interest in seeing students with this type of background. So far no students are enrolled. If a student had to drop from the Co-op programme they would have to either go into a Major or another Specialization.

It was asked (Dubas) whether the splitting of laboratory courses implied that students would have to spend double the amount of time to complete the same number of credits.

It was clarified (Pallen) that this was not the case, and that the above change resulted from a problem with students in the Co-op Programme who tried to get an NSERC grant for their work term in certain industries. The NSERC grant and other scholarships require that students take 15 credits per term. CHEM 338 and 339 were not available for students in Year 1. Now the courses are available as one credit courses, so that students can take 15 credits rather than 16 credits per term.

Classics (C-3)

It was stated (Dicks) that the new Major in Latin and Classical Studies was a re-organisation of current courses into a new programme.

It was announced (Trudel) that two weeks ago the Classics Department's students won a very prestigious prize.

It was added (Brown) that there has been a resurgence of Latin in the U.S. and Canada and there is a serious shortage of Latin teachers. This new programme will satisfy a genuine need, without budgetary implications; the programme will also not require students to take Greek language courses, which in general are not required to teach Latin.

The Classics Department was complimented (Arbuckle-Maag) that it was able to have a 48 credit Major approved by Faculty Council; it was assumed that this was possible because two disciplines were embodied in the new programme.

Library Studies (C-4)

It was stated (Dicks) that the curriculum changes were mostly changes in course titles and descriptions. There was no further discussion.

Modern Languages and Linguistics (C-5)

It was stated (Dicks) that the complete proposal was not included due to the volume of the proposal (80 pages), the rationale was added.

Clarification was requested (Oppenheim) regarding the statement that the department "will maintain two levels of language instruction" in the cases of Hebrew and Russian.

In response it was stated (Barton) that in the case of Hebrew the existing introductory and intermediate courses (12 credits) will continue being taught, as has been the case for the past 6 years at least. The courses being deleted are those that have not been offered in the past. In the case of Russian, the existing 210 and 250 courses, which are conventional language courses that stress speaking/understanding/writing, will be discontinued with the departure of the department's tenure-track position in Russian. However, because of the enormous and growing importance of Russian as a tool of scholarship it is believed useful that this Faculty give instruction in

Russian for students who would need to be able to read Russian for purposes of academic research in any field. The Russian course has been restructured to be an academic reading course, which will be more accelerated than the present course. A follow-up course will be offered according to demand.

Science and Human Affairs (C-6)

It was stated (Dicks) that the SCHA 260 course is a new offering by the Canal 29/23 Cable Television vehicle. The offering of courses on this vehicle is an experiment which the Faculty is beginning. It is planned to offer up to two courses on an experimental basis in the current year. Many questions have not been resolved at this time. If in fact the results of the experimental courses are negative, they will have to be withdrawn from the calendar.

In response to a question (Newsham) it was stated (Dicks) that the course will be administered by either a Full-time or Part-time professor. This has not been resolved. It will be part of a faculty member's workload. There will be a cost, but not a net cost. As it stands, this will most probably be handled through a re-organisation of the department's current offerings.

It was asked (Orr) whether the instructor who administers the course will also be appearing on air or has the course simply been bought to be shown without any input from Concordia.

In response it was stated (Dicks) that there will be 3 to 10 minute segments linking the tapes of James Burke from the BBC. This is one of the outstanding issues. It is foreseeable that Concordia may contribute more to such programmes (e.g. produce programs locally), but initially "ready made" programs will be used.

The Dean added that the expense of creating courses at Concordia, over and above the cost implications of paying the required royalties to the BBC, may be far greater.

It was further added (Dicks) that giving broadcast courses involves important policy issues (e.g. attracting new students from outside Quebec, public relations reasons, saving classroom space, off campus courses). Depending on the goal, different methods to achieve the goal have to be chosen. Long term policy will probably solve some of those issues.

It was questioned (Ryan) whether Concordia had the kind of faculty who will not look "rather third rate" after J. Burke's presentations. It was also questioned whether Concordia faculty can take on such a course to be taught the way it should be.

In response it was stated (Dicks) that packaged well established programmes have been chosen for the major part of the broadcast; the parts supplied by Concordia will be "fillers" that will provide information on subsequent lectures, exams, etc...

In response to the question (Murphy) of what exactly this programme is bringing to the viewer, it was stated (Dicks) that this programme would provide some kind of structure and interaction with faculty.

It was further stated (Valaskakis) that the Faculty should become active in the Canal System, and this initial approach is one way of doing so. It is enormously time consuming and successful to put together a course on television and very often not absolutely inspiring either to the students or for the person who creates such a programme. Sliding into this type of programme (especially as a strong English presence) through courses that have already been put together seems to be a wise starting point, and in the future Concordia itself can establish its own capabilities.

The Canal System may in future be an extremely important area particularly in reaching Northern Quebec, and while the Faculty cannot jump into this type of system immediately, Council should encourage this initial step on an experimental basis.

The Dean announced that Associate Professor Anne Galler accepted an appointment from the Vice-Rector, Academic to be in charge of Off-Campus Education and Distance Learning and one of the mandates of her position is to explore the most effective ways through which Concordia can enter into what appears to be a growing part of education, distance learning. It is presumed that within the next year there will be a report and a discussion of the directions that Concordia might follow.

Another question (Oppenheim) regarding the role of the instructor was raised.

In response, it was confirmed (Dicks) that the role of the instructor will be to provide feedback to students, as well as become involved in instructional design particularly in the design of future versions of the course so that it becomes more effective, such as is the case with the

Computer Literacy courses. The instructors of these courses keep the programme up-to-date and devise the instructional materials. It is clear that the issue of feedback is going to be very critical in this type of course.

It was agreed (Verthuy) that feedback will be critical; however, no indication has been provided as to how the feedback will be obtained and organized. Periodic meetings, in addition to written feedback, between faculty and students is extremely important as well, and there is no guarantee in the proposal that such an exchange will take place. This course, as a starting point in entering this field, is the crucial one and Council should know, prior to voting on the adoption of it, what will be built into it in terms of feedback, Concordia's presence, and allowances that will be made for students who take this course to get together. The budget should also be reviewed more closely, as there will most probably be mailing, telephone and audio-visual expenses. While the concept itself is good, it was recommended (Verthuy) that Council should be presented with more information prior to approving it (i.e. what will actually happen, how will it be run, what services will be offered to students who register for this course).

It was stressed (Dicks) that this proposal was merely for the purpose of getting the information into the calendar; this was not a test case. The test cases will be run this Fall and in those cases the Curriculum Committee has much more explicit ideas from the instructors as to what they will do. This is a proposed calendar entry, and as in all proposed calendar entries the Curriculum Committee does not go into the details of how exactly everything is done in a course.

While this programme was considered positive for students who live outside of Montreal, further reservation was expressed regarding the offering of such courses on campus.

Vote: CARRIED

Graduate (Document ASFC 88-4M-C, Report 61 G, Part 1)

88-4-9

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Trudel) that Faculty Council adopt the 1989-90 Graduate Curriculum Course Change Proposals (Document ASFC 88-4M-C, Report 61 G, Part 1):

Diploma in Adult Education

Diploma in Community Politics and the Law

Council unanimously approved Document ASFC 88-4M-C, Report 61 G, Part 1.

b) Department of Chemistry - Change of Name

88-4-10 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Pallen) that Council approve the change of name of the Department of Chemistry to that of Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

This motion was unanimously approved.

c) ESL Courses

Mr Orr presented Council with a problem that arose from the practice of awarding credit for courses in English as a Second Language - more specifically the issue of awarding a maximum of six ESL credits to students in 90-credit programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science. This limit of awarding a maximum of 6 credits for ESL courses has also been applied to M.E.P. (108 credits) and E.C.P. (120 credits) students, even though in many cases a condition of admission had been that they take 9 credits in ESL of which only 6 credits will be credited.

It was felt (Orr) that the practice of awarding a maximum of six credits for ESL courses taken within the M.E.P. and E.C.P. was inconsistent with a motion passed by Senate (Minutes of May 28, 1982, p.14) that reads:

"It was understood that insofar as students in an extended credit program were concerned, the limit would be more than six credits."

The problem is that the 6 credit limit rule should not apply to students in 108 and 120 credit programs, as the policy was specifically meant for students in 90 credit programs. Students are now finding out (prior to graduation in their last semester) that they are 3 credits short. Student transcripts never indicated that the additional 3 ESL credits would not count towards their degree. This error should be corrected. It was therefore moved and seconded (Orr/O'Hara) that Faculty Council adopt the following motion:

- 88-4-11 a) Be it resolved that the Arts and Science Faculty Council mandate the Vice-Dean, Student Affairs to make a listing of all students admitted between 1983-84 to 1987-88 to Extended Credit or Mature Entry (non 90 credit) undergraduate programs who were denied credits for taking more than 6 credits of English as a Second Language,

- b) and be it further resolved that Arts and Science Faculty Council recommend to the University Senate that these students who were denied credits, and are still enrolled in the University be granted these credits,
- c) and further that those students who are no longer enrolled in the University but have graduated, and were forced to take a further 3 credit course to make up for those that were denied, be financially reimbursed the tuition costs that were incurred by them.

It was added (Orr) that the last paragraph was included as many of the students who had to take an additional course were international students, and therefore charged international student fees for a course they did not have to take.

The motion was supported (Murphy/Drysdale) and viewed (Drysdale) as an injustice considering the quote from the Senate Minutes of May 28, 1982.

It was added (Martin) that this issue was first raised by the Ombudsman's Office and a listing of students affected by this policy should already be available.

It was questioned (Auchinachie) whether it was a good idea to award more than six credits even in a 108 or 120 credit programme, especially when one considers the original purpose for which the awarding of a maximum of six credits for ESL courses was adopted; it was thought inappropriate to award more than 6 credits for courses that are elementary and preparatory. It was suggested that this issue should perhaps be brought forward again for clarification and discussion.

The Dean clarified that the proposed motion was not in any way changing the rules that were adopted. The purpose of this motion was to correct an error and to enforce a rule as it was adopted. The 1982 decision was that the 6 credit ESL limit was meant for students in 90 credit programmes, and that student in 108 or 120 credit programmes would receive credit for up to nine (9) credits in ESL. The debate on the limit may be reopened by Faculty Council at any time, but that is not the issue at hand and therefore should not be reopened.

Further clarification was requested (Oppenheim) as the quoted statement from the May 28, 1982 Senate Minutes did not specify the limit.

In response it was stated (Pallen) that it was clear that the issue at hand was a maximum of nine ESL credits for 108 or 120 credit programme students (i.e. the issue of awarding an additional 3 credits to M.E.P. and E.C.P. students).

Faculty Council unanimously adopted Part a) and b) of the above-mentioned motion.

With regard to Part c) of the motion it was stated (Ryan) that it was unrealistic to expect the University to reimburse the tuition costs that were incurred by students, as these students did take the courses and learned something in them.

Clarification was requested (MacPherson) if Faculty Council can address the issue of student refunds.

In response the Dean stated that Faculty Council can make a statement of principle on any item that it wishes. An item of this sort would not only have to go through the University Senate, but also be approved by the Board of Governors.

It was further stated (Verthuy) that this was a reasonable proposal and it is important that Faculty Council make a statement of principle as the rule was imposed by the University and hardship was involved.

It was asked (Arbuckle-Maag) how the distinction will be made between those students who were forced to take 123 credits (solely due to the regulation) and those who took 123 credits by choice.

In response it was stated (Martin) that it would not be difficult to make the distinction.

Vote: CARRIED

(In favour 19, opposed 5, abstentions 9)

d) Proposed Amendment to the Regulation on the Prohibition of Examinations (Document ASFC 88-4M-E, Report 59 U)

88-4-12 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Verthuy) that Faculty Council approve the proposed Amendment to the Regulation on the Prohibition of Examinations in the last week of the term (Document ASFC 88-4M-E).

It was stated (Dicks) that the proposed amendment is not an attempt to reverse or change the regulation, but clarify it

and make it work more effectively for the purposes for which it was originally passed.

Dean Bertrand clarified that the issue at hand was the replacement of the wording of the paragraph under "therefore be it resolved" on page 1 by the proposed paragraph on page 2 of document ASFC 88-4M-E.

Clarification was requested (Drysdale) regarding:

- 1) the question of whether inforcement of part a) is feasible;
- 2) the wording of part b); the following wording was suggested: "No final examination shall take place prior to the final examination period."
- 3) the fact that the proposal runs counter to the spirit and letter of the current regulation.

It was also stated (Orr) that the proposal was not necessary as the existing regulation provides for exceptions for certain courses by allowing instructors to request that Council approve that a final examination be given during the last week of the term.

It was further stated (Dubas) that more clarification is necessary as the proposed document did not seem clear; this affects certain laboratory examinations which are given at the end of lab courses which do not run for 13 weeks.

The Dean clarified that this item has been brought to Council from the Curriculum Committee and it can be sent back for reworking.

Further opposition was expressed (Brown) regarding the wording that seems to indicate that periodic tests are superior to final examinations. Considering how short the Canadian academic year is, as well as the time that tests take up, everyone should be required to give a final examination during the 3-hour examination periods. Such examinations should indicate a substantial amount of what the student had gained from the course and should consequently be recognized as a substantial amount of the student's final grade.

It was further stated (Valaskakis) that everyone should indeed be required to teach 13 weeks considering how short the term is, that the University should have an examination system of some sort, and that Council recommend to Senate and insist that there be a distinction between the exam period, the registration period, the summer school, as well as make up dates for exams. This issue involves many concerns, but it seems that there is a lack of clarity

regarding how this proposal is stated and the concerns expressed would justify tabling this item and sending it back to the Steering Committee.

88-4-13 It was moved and seconded (Valaskakis/Brown) to table this motion until the next ASFC meeting.

CARRIED

The Dean suggested that the item be returned to the Curriculum Committee rather than the Steering Committee, as it originated from the Curriculum Committee.

8. Other Business

Notice was given (O'Hara) that the following motion will be forwarded to the Steering Committee for consideration of Faculty Council at their next meeting:

Whereas the percentage of undergraduate student representation on Council has been decreasing since 1980,

Whereas the allocation of one extra student representative to Council would almost completely compensate for the growth of the other groups represented on Council,

Whereas Document ASC 80-4-D14 should be revised to reflect changes that have occurred in the Faculty since 1980,

This Council urges that:

- 1) The Dean's Office propose an updated version of Document ASC 80-4-D14 for consideration by Council
- 2) This updated version of Document 80-4-D14 increase the undergraduate student representation from 16 to 17 representatives.

9) Next Meeting

Friday, May 13, 1988, at 9:30 a.m. in AD-131, Loyola Campus.

10) Adjournment

88-4-14 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Pallen) that the meeting be adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

CARRIED